

REMARKS

The allowability of claims 6-9 and 11 is acknowledged appreciatively.

Nevertheless, claim 1 is reorganized without narrowing and put into Jepson or improvement form with Festo implications to emphasize that it is the combination of particular components that is being claimed as a whole. To this, the rejection under 35 USC 103 for obviousness from the cited Wilke, et al. and DeGrace patents merely selects pieces from the patents to reconstruct the invention piecemeal, which is, of course, the improper use of hindsight.

It is not "features" but the subject matter of the invention "as a whole" that must be considered, 35 USC §103. That features, even distinguishing features are "disclosed" in the prior art is alone insufficient.

..... The test is whether the claimed invention as a whole, in light of all the teachings of the references in their entireties, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Connell, et al. v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 220 USPQ 197, 199 (Fed.Cir. 1983).

To this, the Action concludes:


It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Wilke, et al. by replacing the weld with a click-on capability as taught by DeGrace in order to be able to easily separate the housings from each [other] when necessary.

However, as so admitted in the Action, the teaching of the Wilke, et al. patent is a weld, which is a fixed connection teaching the opposite of the click-on capability claimed, and the teaching of the DeGrace patent is for a filter, which inherently clogs as its filtering function to teach click-on access for de-clogging, and not an injector as in Wilke, et al. and claim 1, which is not supposed to clog and, therefore, does not teach toward access, whereby the

Wilke, et al. patent has its weld. There is, therefore, none of the necessary teaching in the combination of patents toward the claimed invention as required to sustain the rejection.

Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, requested.

Respectfully submitted,



William R. Evans
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
26 West 61st Street
New York, New York 10023
Reg. No. 25858
Tel. No. (212) 708-1930